

The Delusion of **BRAHMINISM**

ABDUR REHMAN GIRI

Foreword

Social justice and equality are the pressing need of the time. They are needed not only for the economic upliftment of a nation, but also for human dignity. Frankly speaking, inequality is found, in one form or the other, in almost all societies across the world, but the kind of inequality in the form of caste-system, the Hindu society is replete with, has no parallel in human history. This is the only society in the world which accords religious sanctity to this inhuman practice. And the Brahmins, who commanded innumeral privileges and immunity, played a decisive role in the formation of this cast-system.

This booklet is designed to shed some light on the meaning and origin of 'Brahmins' and their role in the Hindu society. In this booklet, a sincere effort is made to spell out how the Brahmins had emerged as an all-powerful caste. What were their inherent qualities? How had they successfully maintained their supremacy? And what was the logic behind the religious sanctity to the caste-system? This booklet is also a sincere endeavour to dispel the misconception of Brahmins' high origin. The purpose of this booklet is not to hurt the sentiments of any community, but in reality, it is brought out to serve the humanity at large.

World Parliament of Religious Dialogue feels honoured in publishing this booklet and extends its deep gratitude to all those who helped the WPRD, in whatever form and measure, in bringing out this booklet.

May Allah guide us to the right path and accept our humble efforts made for His cause.

Chairman
WPRD

Foreword

Social justice and equality are the pressing need of the time. We are needed not only for the economic development of the country but also for human dignity. Privately speaking, inequality is found more between the rich and the poor, but the gap is widening. In almost all societies across the world, the rich are getting richer and the poor are getting poorer. The Hindu society is no exception. It is a pity that the Hindu society is not yet aware of this fact. The Hindu society is still in the grip of caste-discrimination. The caste-system is a social evil which has no parallel in human history. It is the only social system in the world which records religious sanctity in its institutional practice. And the Brahmins, who considered themselves privileged and dominant, played a decisive role in the formation of this caste-system.

This booklet is designed to shed some light on the meaning and origin of Brahminism, and thereby to help the Hindu society to understand the caste-system. A sincere effort is made to show that the Brahmins had emerged as an all-powerful caste. What were their inherent qualities? How had they successfully maintained their supremacy? And what was the logic behind the religious sanctity in the caste-system? This booklet is also a sincere endeavour to dispel the misconception of Brahmins' high origin. The purpose of this booklet is not to hurt the sentiments of any community, but in reality, it is brought out to serve the humanity at large.

World Parliament of Religious Dialogue Book Series publishing this booklet and extends its deep gratitude to all those who helped the WPRD in whatever form and manner in bringing out this booklet.

May Allah guide us to the right path and accept our humble efforts made for His cause.

WPRD
World Parliament of Religious Dialogue Book Series

The Delusion of Brahminism

Is the caste-system, in any way, related to the formation of the Hindu religion? Is the caste or varna system useful for social as well as religious formation, or it is a blot on humanity? Is the caste-system related to the religious values of the society? Is the caste-system a social process, a religious process or a cultural process? Does the caste-system entitle any particular class to supremacy in the process of religious formation? Is the principle of caste-system propounded by the creator of the Universe? Has the poisonous creeper of caste-system come into existence along with the creation of the world? What is the nature of caste-system in Hinduism and which caste commands supremacy in this social set-up? We will try to answer these questions in the present write-up.

Although innumerable question marks have been put over the castes and the varna-system, but we will concentrate only on caste-system and the role of Brahmins in the society. Till now, all the articles and books written on caste-system have discussed mainly the condition and social status of the Shudras in the society. No one has tried to debate on who is a Brahmin and what is his role in the present caste-system. I think there is an urgent necessity to know who a Brahmin is. Why he is called a Brahmin and what sort of mental make-up does he represent?

World Parliament of Religious Dialogue Book Series

World Parliament of Religious Dialogue Book Series

In reference to the Vedic literature one thing is clear that caste-system was the part of the Hindu society from the very beginning. As a result, Brahmins came into being as a very dominant class. I have been thinking for many years why the Brahmins had emerged as a very powerful caste. What were their inherent qualities? How had they maintained their supremacy? What was the religious base of the caste-system? Did God bless them (Brahmins) with these rights? Did the religious formation play any role in providing the Brahmins the position of reverence? After all, what were the circumstances that the religion had to change its nature? What were the virtues of the Brahmins that despite their not doing any work they became the regulators of the society? After an in-depth study and research for many years, I have got success in analysing the Vedic literature. The study of the Vedic literature, Smritis, Grihsutras and other scriptures made the subject very interesting. During the period of my study, I encountered a number of mysterious aspects. Relying on my study, I have reached new inferences. That is why I dare to write something on the subject.

Caste-system is deeply related to the Hindu society. There is no room for human sensitivity in a society which implements the intriguing plans in the name of social dynamism. The social development touches its high there where the rule of equality and brotherhood rules the roost. But Hinduism is an example where intrigues were freely pressed into practice in order to command the supremacy in the name of equality. The desire to know others and the attitude to treat all the humans alike are the preconditions for equality. The curiosity for knowledge and tolerance are the important features of a sensitive society. But the proud society does not show any inclination towards equality. And the Hindu religious formation is a fine example of the second category.

To mean with equality is an endeavour for understanding others and the desire to join one with the sensitivity of others. In this way, the process of equality starts in the society. Such desires are not

possible in a society which is divided in castes and sub-castes. The Hindus, being divided into different castes and sub-castes, are wasting their energies in providing the superiority to a few castes. We can hardly expect sensitivity in such a society.

For an ideal society, the first and foremost condition is that all the people should be treated equally. Every person has his own qualities and limitations. But in the socio-religious system of Hinduism, a man is bound to adhere to many restrictions and controls. Struggling for the whole life is his fate. Therefore, we have to understand a man with all his references. When a religion develops with such attitudes towards human beings, it is but natural that the phenomena of 'upper class' and 'lower class' also raises its head in such a society.

The society, where feudal mentality, autocratic attitude and complex of superiority are found in abundance, can neither provide nor encourage an atmosphere of equality. On the contrary, an opposition brews but it cannot be shaped into a revolution. Undoubtedly, the society, time and again, pin point the need of equality and dialogue. All the human beings are equal, their sorrows are equal and their fates are equal. No caste or varna has patent over the knowledge or intelligence. A man of any country can think originally about any subject and with the help of his research and labour can establish new principles. This kind of healthy attitude is a must for an ideal society. One more aspect is also there. There is an urgent necessity to understand the people who are working in the field of knowledge. And this is possible only when the society is based on the fundamentals of equality. In fact, there is a need to redefine the concept of equality. If it happens, equality will automatically make its way in the society. And this is possible only when there is no room for superiority or inferiority in the society. The caste-system in our country provided the people with two kinds of mentalities, i.e., superiority and inferiority. These kinds of mentalities cannot be useful for the development of knowledge.

This is illogical to say that sensitive and wise people do not live there where people live in water-tight compartments of castes and creeds. Such talents do live there, but they feel themselves safe in their respective dens. The people of their respective castes project them as 'great personalities' and they too live in the world of illusion. They keep themselves almost ignorant of the developments taking place in other languages, religions and societies. This happens because of their ego which does not permit them to recognise others superior to them.

This kind of attitude is deeply related to caste-system, varna-system and the Hindu mentality. In a country, where is no caste-system, the democratic social system is pacing at fast and a man commands respect in such a socio-religious system. Actually, everybody desires to reach others, but not to accept others, as they are, is the feature of Hindu mentality. This is not mere a co-incidence that the Brahmin culture started running parallel with the Vedic culture. In fact, the Brahmin culture was avowed to crush the democratic values and create inequality and hatred amongst people in the name of religion, caste and varna.

In Indian context, the Brahmin culture and subsequently their supremacy over the other castes came out as a danger to the society. As a result, the Vedas were made mysterious. The conspiracy to keep the Vedas and Upanishads away from the public was hatched even in the Vedic period. And the result was that most of the people could not go through these religious scriptures. On the other hand, there is a long tradition of the Bible and the Quran, deeply related to the common people. Why this happened? The answer is very simple. All this happened because of the 'superiority complex' in the Hindus.

In the process, the varna-system blunted the thinking and creativity of the country. That is why, the tendency of 'Koop-Manduk' was developed. The complexion is still continue in our country. The condition is the same in spite of emergence of Islam in

India. The followers of Islam got the Vedas, Upanishads and other Indian literature translated into Arabi and Persian, but how many books of Arabic and Persian are found translated into Indian languages? Therefore, this is high time to expose those persons who hatched the conspiracy to divide the people in the name of caste and subsequently unleashed hatred in the society. This is the most pertinent question we are discussing here. Obviously, the proponent of that conspiracy were the Brahmins. But why this happened is also noteworthy.

The ego of the Brahmins is exposed when they describe themselves to be born from the mouth of Brahma, the Creator of the Universe, if we believe Hinduism. But the question is : Did all the Brahmins get birth from the mouth of Brahma?

The above-mentioned caste-system gets support from the Purush Sukta of Rigveda. This is the only mention of caste-system in the Rigveda.

No doubt, this verse of two lines divided the society in four classes and gave a lie to the definition of equality. We will discuss about the incorporation of Purush Sukta at a later date. Now we concentrate only what this verse is? The Purush Sukta of Rigveda says thus :

*Bramhanoasya mukhmaseetbahu rajnay kritah
Uru tadasya yadweshah padbhyaman shudroajayatt.*

- Rigveda - 10/90/12

- Rigveda - 1/113/16

- Yajurveda - 31/11

That is, "Brahma created the Brahmins from his mouth, the Kshatriyas from his arms, the Vaishyas from his thighs and the Sudras from his feet."

No doubt, this verse proves the superiority of the Brahmins, but the question is why was the verse of such vital importance mentioned only in the Purush Sukta? Why were the words 'Sudra' and 'Vaishya' not used anywhere, but in the Purush Sukta? When we talk about the significance of any scripture, it is quite natural to ask a question why such an important illustration had been described only once in the Vedas.

After this commentary of Purush Sukta about the creation of the Universe, the Brahmins emerged as a powerful class and very surprising conditions came into being for becoming a Brahmin. Before debating on who a Brahmin is, what his merits are and what the pre-conditions are for becoming a Brahmin, this is relevant to know the meaning of the word 'Brahmin' in the Vedas.

The word 'Brahmin' is used at a number of places in the Rigveda. But this is not used for any particular caste, class or varna. This is mentioned in the Aitareya Brahmin, "Soma (the moon tree, the intoxicating juice of which Brahmins used to drink) was the drink of the Brahmins, while the Kshatriyas had to crush the fruits to squeeze out juice for themselves." This statement suggests that by the time of Aitareya Brahmin, the Brahmins and Kshatriyas had emerged as two separate classes. But this is not proved by this illustration whether this classification was based on birth or occupation and inter-feasting and inter-marriages were allowed amongst them or not. Although this is very difficult to say anything about this subject, but we have some evidences which prove that by the time of Dharmasutras, the Brahminism had become hereditary.

According to the Rigveda, the word 'Brahma' means 'to pray' or 'to praise'. The word 'Brahma' is positively used for the Brahmin, a caste, in the Atharva Veda (2/15/4). The use of the word 'Brahma' for Brahmins was spontaneous for the Brahmins because they were the authors of prayers and praises. But by that time the classification of Brahmins and Kshatriyas was not made on the grounds of birth.

In fact, this was based on occupation. In support of this fact, there is a story in the Rigveda, which runs thus — Devapi and Shantanu were the two sons of Rishtishen. Although Shantanu was younger to Devapi, but he was made the King because the later declined the kingship. Because of the sinful conduct of Shantanu, there occurred a famine. By performing a yagya Devapi caused it to rain. Devapi performed the duties of Shantanu's preceptor (purohit). It is clear, therefore, that all the persons in a family were free to adopt any occupation. In this way, this illustration negates the authenticity of the varna-system described in the Purush Sukta. In another verse, a poet says, "I am a poet, my father is a doctor and my mother grinds flour. In spite of being the members of one family, we use to earn our livelihood by different occupations." Therefore, this is very difficult to draw any conclusion about the opinion of the Rigveda on the caste-system. As a result, there emerged a deep confusion about the Vedic opinion on the theory of human creation.

When we talk about the Purush Sukta, the fact comes out that every Brahmin should take birth from the mouth of Brahma. But other illustrations contradict this fact. The result is a contradiction on who a Brahmin actually is.

We will discuss all the possible logics to explain who a Brahmin is? Is the body a Brahmin? Is the caste of birth is a Brahmin? Is the knowledge a Brahmin? Is the conduct a Brahmin? Is the work a Brahmin? Is the Veda a Brahmin? Is the man a Brahmin by his birth or by virtue of his knowledge? Is the man a Brahmin because he follows the rituals of his community or because of his expertise in the Vedas? In the light of the illustrations, mentioned in the Hindu scriptures, we will try our best to unfold the truth about who a Brahmin is.

Is the Soul a Factor for Becoming a Brahmin?

The Purush Sukta of Rigveda propounds the principle, which

says that the man is a Brahmin by his birth. The Brahmins are created, says the Purush Sukta, from the mouth of Brahma. But the Shatpath Brahmin, a branch of Yajurveda, refutes this theory of Brahminism and says that only the soul is not sufficient for becoming a Brahmin. Therefore, deriving a conclusion that 'the soul is a Brahmin', says the Shatpath Brahmin, is a misconception. This not only repudiates the principle of the Purush Sukta but also removes the controversies which are abusing the human values. Shatpath Brahmin says thus :

Surya pashuraseet.

Soma pashuraseet.

Indra pashuraseet.

- Shatpath Brahmin - 13/2/7/13-15
- Kalhak Samhita - 5/5/4
- Ashaw Megh - 5/5/4
- Vajasaneyei Samhita - 23/17
- Teiteriya Samhita - 5/7/26

That is, "The sun was an animal, the Moon was an animal, and the Indra was an animal." The above-mentioned illustrations are about the three important gods of the Hindus. The Sun, also mentioned as 'Savita' in the Vedas, is the god of light. The Moon is supposed to be the symbol of Shiva (one of the trinity of Hinduism), and the Indra is believed to be the King of the gods. The Sun is also mentioned, though occasionally, as an old Brahmin in the Vedas. The Moon is also mentioned as the god of yagya and the Indra is mentioned as the Brahmin of Brahmins. According to the Shatpath Brahmin, the Sun, the Moon and the Indra were animals in their previous births. Here emerges the confusion when we are told that an animal in one birth becomes a god in another birth. I mean to say that the animals became gods - the Sun, the Moon, and the Indra - and all these three became Brahmins. Therefore, the fact becomes quite evident that nobody can be a Brahmin by his birth. If it was so,

how could the animals become the gods? Even the dog-eaters become gods by way of their transmigration. In this way, the Vedas repudiate the validity of its own principles.

As a result, the Hindus are in an enigmatic situation to accept which of the principles. If they believe the Purush Sukta, they have no alternative but to accept that one is the Brahmin by his birth. But when they believe the Upanishads, the principle of Purush Sukta is proved untrue. Moreover, if we accept the ingredients of the Purush Sukta, the importance of the Sun, the Moon, and the Indra, the three gods of the Hindus, comes to an end because they were not Brahmins by their birth, while according to the Purush Sukta one can be a Brahmin by virtue of his birth. Therefore, one, who had lived the life of an animal and got Brahminism, could not be recognised as a Brahmin. But this had not happened because the non-acceptance of the Sun, the Moon and the Indra as Brahmins was to mean the repudiation of Upanishads. On the contrary, the acceptance of Upanishads could be considered as a challenge to the authority of the Vedas. In such circumstances, the Hindus were bound to live a life of contradictions. Therefore, in order to avoid the confrontation both the principles were accepted and presented in a new form, i.e., the transmigration. And this principle of transmigration played a very important role in the removal of many controversies of Hinduism. On this basis we can say that only the soul is not sufficient for becoming a Brahmin.

The Smiritis also refute the principle of Purush Sukta. Thus is said:

*Sapat byadhah dasharneshu mrigah kalanjarauo girao.
Chakrawaka shardweepe hansa sarsi manse.
Teapee jatah kurukshetre bramhna ved paraga.*

- Harivansh Puran - 24/20-21

That is, "The seven tigers of Dasharn, the deers of Kalanjar mountain, ruddy-geese of Shardweep and the swans of Mansarovar were expert in the Vedas. All of them became Brahmins in Kurukshetra."

This illustration clarifies two things. Firstly, for becoming a Brahmin the birth in a Brahmin family was not compulsory. Secondly, the tigers, deers, ruddy-geese, and swan were expert in the Vedas, in spite of the fact that the Vedas were not easily available to human beings. The question is, how had they got expertise in the Vedas? The Vedic literature does not throw any light on whether there was any school for teaching birds and animals. If there was no such school, how did those birds and animals become expert in the Vedas? To avoid the confusion, here also the principle of transmigration was repeated and the tigers, deers, geese and swans were called the Brahmins. Whether this verse of the Mahabharat serves any purpose or not, but it repudiates the principle of Brahminism based on birth.

Manusmriti too refutes the Purush Sukta's theory of Brahminism based on birth. Moreover, it sets some conditions for becoming a Brahmin and simultaneously warns a Brahmin with dire consequences, if he violates these conditions. Thus says the Manusmriti:

*Adhitya chaturvedan sangopangeov tawtatah
Shudrapati-grahgrahhee bramhna jayeti kharah
Kharo dwadash janani etyenv manubrabeet.*

- Manusmriti - 10/109-110

That is, "If a Brahmin, even if he has learnt the four Vedas, receives charity from a Shudra, he gets birth as an ass and remains in that gene for twelve consecutive births. Hereafter, he gets birth as a dog and remains there for seventy consecutive births."

Manusmriti not only denies the principle of the Purush Sukta that a Brahmin gets birth from the mouth of Brahma, but also rejects the Vedas, though indirectly. We will not go in details of how Manu played an important role in establishing Brahminism, we will concentrate on our main subject. As described in Manusmriti, the Brahminism of a Brahmin ends if he receives charity from a Shudra or he seeks help of other births for repentance. This shows that only the birth is not sufficient for becoming a Brahmin. This instruction of Manu suggests that Brahminism was not a permanent phenomenon, it could be changed according to the circumstances. Manu laid down some rules and their violations invited the punishment. Why Manu rejected the principle of the Purush Sukta is a separate subject for discussion, but one thing is clear that the religious guidelines propounded by Manu created more confusion, instead of removing it. Therefore, I feel no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that principle of the Purush Sukta is not only proved wrong but also rejected by other religious scriptures, which have propounded their own principles about varna system.

The theory of the Manusmriti is almost accepted in the Mahabharat. This is said in the Anushasan Parva of the Mahabharat:

*Adhitya chaturvedan dweejo mohsamanveetah.
Pateetapratigrahyath kharyonau prajayte
Kharo jeveet varshani dash panch cha bhart.*

- Mahabharat, Anushasan Parva- 111/46-47

That is, "Even a scholar, who has read all the four Vedas, gets a birth as an ass, if he does any work not worthy for a Brahmin. And he remains as an ass for fifteen consecutive births."

According to the Mahabharat, birth is not a base for Brahminism. If birth is the base, how can the Brahminism be terminated on other grounds? Every religious principle has its own importance and it

That is, "The seven tigers of Dasharn, the deers of Kalanjar mountain, ruddy-geese of Shardweep and the swans of Mansarovar were expert in the Vedas. All of them became Brahmins in Kurukshetra."

This illustration clarifies two things. Firstly, for becoming a Brahmin the birth in a Brahmin family was not compulsory. Secondly, the tigers, deers, ruddy-geese, and swan were expert in the Vedas, in spite of the fact that the Vedas were not easily available to human beings. The question is, how had they got expertise in the Vedas? The Vedic literature does not throw any light on whether there was any school for teaching birds and animals. If there was no such school, how did those birds and animals become expert in the Vedas? To avoid the confusion, here also the principle of transmigration was repeated and the tigers, deers, geese and swans were called the Brahmins. Whether this verse of the Mahabharat serves any purpose or not, but it repudiates the principle of Brahminism based on birth.

Manusmriti too refutes the Purush Sukta's theory of Brahminism based on birth. Moreover, it sets some conditions for becoming a Brahmin and simultaneously warns a Brahmin with dire consequences, if he violates these conditions. Thus says the Manusmriti:

*Adhitya chaturo vedan sangopangeov tawtatah
Shudrapati-grahgrahhee bramhna jayeti kharah
Kharo dwadash janani etyenv manubrabeet.*

- Manusmriti - 10/109-110

That is, "If a Brahmin, even if he has learnt the four Vedas, receives charity from a Shudra, he gets birth as an ass and remains in that gene for twelve consecutive births. Hereafter, he gets birth as a dog and remains there for seventy consecutive births."

Manusmriti not only denies the principle of the Purush Sukta that a Brahmin gets birth from the mouth of Brahma, but also rejects the Vedas, though indirectly. We will not go in details of how Manu played an important role in establishing Brahminism, we will concentrate on our main subject. As described in Manusmriti, the Brahminism of a Brahmin ends if he receives charity from a Shudra or he seeks help of other births for repentance. This shows that only the birth is not sufficient for becoming a Brahmin. This instruction of Manu suggests that Brahminism was not a permanent phenomenon, it could be changed according to the circumstances. Manu laid down some rules and their violations invited the punishment. Why Manu rejected the principle of the Purush Sukta is a separate subject for discussion, but one thing is clear that the religious guidelines propounded by Manu created more confusion, instead of removing it. Therefore, I feel no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that principle of the Purush Sukta is not only proved wrong but also rejected by other religious scriptures, which have propounded their own principles about varna system.

The theory of the Manusmriti is almost accepted in the Mahabharat. This is said in the Anushasan Parva of the Mahabharat:

*Adhitya chaturovedan dweejo mohsamanveetah.
Pateetapratigrahyath kharyonau prajayte
Kharo jeveet varshani dash panch cha bhart.*

- Mahabharat, Anushasan Parva- 111/46-47

That is, "Even a scholar, who has read all the four Vedas, gets a birth as an ass, if he does any work not worthy for a Brahmin. And he remains as an ass for fifteen consecutive births."

According to the Mahabharat, birth is not a base for Brahminism. If birth is the base, how can the Brahminism be terminated on other grounds? Every religious principle has its own importance and it

cannot be changed according to circumstances. When we analyse the principle of Brahminism based on birth, we come to know that most of the Hindu scriptures have repudiated it. In such a condition this becomes very difficult to find out the truth. But the above-mentioned illustrations prove that one cannot become a Brahmin simply on the basis of his birth. This is also clear that birth cannot accord supremacy or intelligence to a Brahmin.

When a soul cannot become a Brahmin by virtue of his birth how can he become a Brahmin on getting birth in a particular caste? But the caste system is continue on the lines mentioned in the Purush Sukta. That is why, in Hinduism nobody commands respect by virtue of his intelligence, but according to the caste, he is born in.

Now it will be relevant, I think, to present the illustrations from Hindu scriptures which suggest that the contemporary Brahmin society accorded Brahminism to those who could pose a challenge to them. This was the period when, on the one hand, a number of new principles were being propounded, and on the other hand, the non-Brahmins, who could pose a threat to the authority of the Brahmins, were being admitted in the Brahmin-fold. Thus says the Mahabharat:

*Hastinyamachalo jatahulukyam keshpingalah
Augustoagast pushpachcha kausheekah kush sambhawah.
Kapilah kapilajjatah shargulmachch gautamah
Dronacharyastu kalshatti tirisitatiri sutah.
Renukajjanyadra bhi amrighayshringmuni mrigi
Kaiwartinyajanyad vyasam ausheek chaiv shudreeka.
Veshwamitram cha chandali vashishatham chaiv urvashi
Na tesham bramhani mata lokacharachch brahminah.*

That is, "Rishi Achal was born of a female elephant, so was Keshpingal of Uluki; Agastya of Agasti flower; Kaushik of a Kush grass; Rishi Kapil of a she-calf and Rishi Gautam of Shargulm. Dronacharya was born of a pitcher, and Rishi Titir of a partridge.

Renuka gave birth to Ram and a doe gave birth to Rishi Shring. Vyas was born of a Bhritya. Kushika was born of a Shudra woman and so was Vishwamitra of a Chandal woman. Urvashi gave birth to Vashistha. Although the mothers of the above-mentioned Rishis did not belong to the Brahmin class, they were accepted as Brahmins."

The above-mentioned illustrations of the 'Smritis' also suggest that caste was not necessarily a pre-condition for becoming a Brahmin. All the Rishis mentioned in these illustrations are even today considered highly esteemed in Hinduism, notwithstanding their birth. The mothers of these Rishis were either unnatural or Shudra women. No one of them belonged to the Brahmin class. In spite of this they were called Brahmins. Therefore, we can say that for becoming a Brahmin, it was not necessary to get birth in a Brahmin family. In this way, 'Smritis' also reject the Rigvedic opinion of varna-system.

There are deep contradictions about the creation of the Universe in the Vedas as well as in the Upanishads and other religious scriptures. When was a man created? Had the God made discriminations amongst human beings? Had Brahma really created the Brahmins from his mouth and the Shudras from his feet? Was the division of society, based on occupations, created by Brahma? These are some questions, the answers of them are not given in Hinduism. As a result, there is a curiosity in a Hindu to know the reality of Hindu society. Why are the Hindu scriptures unable to answer these questions? In the absence of any solution, the Hindus are bound to live a life of confusion. In all, Hinduism is full of contradictions about the creation of the Universe. But when we talk about Islam, there is neither any confusion nor a contradiction about the creation of human beings. Allah says in the Qur'an clearly:

*It is He Who has
Created you from dust.
Then from a sperm-drop,*

*Then from a leech-like clot;
Then does He got you
Out (into the light)
As a child: then lets you
(Grow and) reach your age
Of full strength, then
Lets you become old,
Though of you there are
Some who die before,;
And lets you reach
A term appointed;
in order that ye
May understand.*

Al-Ghafir; 67 (Al-Qur'an)

In the above-mentioned verse Allah clearly describes in detail the creation of the man and the process of creation is presented so clearly and systematically that it will create no confusion. But the process of birth is not described clearly in the Vedas. The Vedas divides the society into four categories on the basis of birth, the Qur'an accords equality to all the people. In the eyes of the Qur'an no man is superior, inferior, higher or lower. All are equals. On the contrary, the Vedas accord superiority to the Brahmins. While the Vedas identify human beings on the basis of their castes, but the Qur'an identifies them as human beings, not in the form of any caste. In this context the Qur'an says thus :

*O mankind ! fear
Your Guardian Lord,
Who created you
From a single person,
Created, out of it,
His mate, and from them twain
Scattered (like seeds)
Countless men and women;*

An-Nisa; 1 (Al-Qur'an)

The above-mentioned verse refutes the principle of the Purush Sukta and says that Allah accords equality to all the people. The caste-system has no existence in His dominion. While the Rigveda played an important role in establishing superiority of the Brahmins on the basis of their birth from the mouth of Brahma, the Qur'an warns the people against this discrimination amongst people on the basis of birth. The Qur'an warns, "O people! fear thy God (Allah) Who has created you from one soul". The Rigveda propounds the caste-system based on the birth, but contrary to this, the Qur'an criticises the caste-system and tries to uproot it. In this way, the Qur'an clarifies that, 'in any circumstances, the human beings cannot be divided into castes'.

The Purush Sukta of the Rigveda clearly instructs that the Brahmins are superior to the other people. No one is entitled to challenge their superiority, because Brahma loves them the most. But the Qur'an clarifies who is dear to Allah. Thus says the Qur'an:

*O mankind! We created
You from a single (pair)
Of a male and a female,
And made you into
Nations and tribes, that
Ye may know each other
Not that ye may despise
(Each other). Verily
The most honoured of you
In the sight of Allah
in (he who is) the most
Righteous of you.
And Allah has full knowledge
And is well acquainted
(With all things).*

Al-Hujurat; 13 (Al-Qur'an)

*Then from a leech-like clot;
Then does He got you
Out (into the light)
As a child: then lets you
(Grow and) reach your age
Of full strength, then
Lets you become old,
Though of you there are
Some who die before,;
And lets you reach
A term appointed;
in order that ye
May understand.*

Al-Ghafir; 67 (Al-Qur'an)

In the above-mentioned verse Allah clearly describes in detail the creation of the man and the process of creation is presented so clearly and systematically that it will create no confusion. But the process of birth is not described clearly in the Vedas. The Vedas divides the society into four categories on the basis of birth, the Qur'an accords equality to all the people. In the eyes of the Qur'an no man is superior, inferior, higher or lower. All are equals. On the contrary, the Vedas accord superiority to the Brahmins. While the Vedas identify human beings on the basis of their castes, but the Qur'an identifies them as human beings, not in the form of any caste. In this context the Qur'an says thus :

*O mankind ! fear
Your Guardian Lord,
Who created you
From a single person,
Created, out of it,
His mate, and from them twain
Scattered (like seeds)
Countless men and women;*

An-Nisa; 1 (Al-Qur'an)

The above-mentioned verse refutes the principle of the Purush Sukta and says that Allah accords equality to all the people. The caste-system has no existence in His dominion. While the Rigveda played an important role in establishing superiority of the Brahmins on the basis of their birth from the mouth of Brahma, the Qur'an warns the people against this discrimination amongst people on the basis of birth. The Qur'an warns, "O people! fear thy God (Allah) Who has created you from one soul". The Rigveda propounds the caste-system based on the birth, but contrary to this, the Qur'an criticises the caste-system and tries to uproot it. In this way, the Qur'an clarifies that, 'in any circumstances, the human beings cannot be divided into castes'.

The Purush Sukta of the Rigveda clearly instructs that the Brahmins are superior to the other people. No one is entitled to challenge their superiority, because Brahma loves them the most. But the Qur'an clarifies who is dear to Allah. Thus says the Qur'an:

*O mankind! We created
You from a single (pair)
Of a male and a female,
And made you into
Nations and tribes, that
Ye may know each other
Not that ye may despise
(Each other). Verily
The most honoured of you
In the sight of Allah
in (he who is) the most
Righteous of you.
And Allah has full knowledge
And is well acquainted
(With all things).*

Al-Hujurat; 13 (Al-Qur'an)

When we analyse the above-mentioned verse, it comes into light that the birth in any particular caste or community is not a pre-condition for making Allah pleased. He blesses those who follow the commands of the divine book and live a very pious life. Therefore, the Qur'an openly accepts that there is no necessity to have a birth in any particular caste or community for making Allah pleased. As the Qur'an has described to uproot superstitious and evilsome deeds, for this purpose, it has laid down some religious guidelines. In other words, Allah loves those who follow the path shown by Prophet Muhammad (S.A.W.). But the Purush Sukta makes no such arrangement.

On the contrary, it divided the society into different castes and creeds. As a result, the feelings of inequality and discontent have taken an ugly turn. The Rigveda and other religious scriptures tried their best to establish the supremacy of the Brahmins. The result is obvious. They command a very influential position in the society. Although they were not in active politics, they got the position of 'Raj Purohit' created for themselves. And this was done in such a way that the King could do nothing without the advice of Raj Purohit. That was the part of a diplomatic strategy of Smritis and scriptures, which wanted to see the Brahmins all powerful. For this purpose, these scriptures termed the Brahmins as gods on the earth, so that no one could challenge their authority. The Brahmins on their part, tried to prove that 'Brahma had accorded them with unlimited powers'. But when we study the Qur'an, such fallacies automatically set on rest because there is no room in the Qur'an for discrimination amongst human beings. The Qur'an clarifies further :

*That He did create
The pairs, - male and female,
From a sperm-drop when lodged
(in its place).*

An-Najm - 45-46 (Al-Qur'an)

This is to remove all confusions whether Allah made any one superior by birth. To clear such misconceptions, Allah says in the Qur'an, "He has created all the human beings, even He has made the pairs of males and females." This verse does not deal with the division of the society but talks about the completeness of human beings. Thus says the Qur'an :

*And (have We not) created
You in pairs.*

An-Naba - 8 (Al-Qur'an)

This verse of the Qur'an also talks about the oneness of humanity. On the contrary, the Purush Sukta talks about the division of humanity on the lines of caste and creed. The Vedas talk about the birth of human beings at two or three places, but to repeat the 'mantra' of the Purush Sukta. I feel no hesitation to claim that the Vedic literature is not in a position of throwing more light on the creation of human beings. In the absence of any well-defined theory about birth in the Hindu scriptures, the Hindus are bound to live a life full of superstitions. But the Qur'an describes the theory of evolution in detail setting all the doubts on rest.

The whole of Hindu religious literature, from the Vedas to Upanishads, Grihsutras, Dharmasutras, the Smritis and Dharmshatras, is almost silent on the theory of evolution, except to mention that 'the Brahmins are created from the mouth of Brahma, the Kshatriyas from his arms, the Vaishyas from his thighs, and the Shudras from his feet'. This verse is unable to clarify the principle of birth. But in spite of this, the principle of the Purush Sukta succeeded in getting religious acceptance. In the absence of any proof, this needs an intense research how it acquired recognition.

But the Qur'an describes the process of birth in detail. According to the Qur'an the process of human birth takes nine months to become a complete one. On this process, the Qur'an says thus:

*Man We did create
from a quintessence (of clay),
Then We placed him
As (a drop of) sperm
In a place of rest,
Firmly fixed,
Then We made the sperm
Into a clot of congealed blood;
Then of that clot We made
A (foetus) lump; then We
Made out of that lump
Bones and clothed the bones
With flesh; then We developed
Out of it another creator
So blessed be Allah,
The best to create!*

- *Al-Muminoon*, 12-14 (*Al-Qur'an*)

In this verse, Allah says about the birth of a child in detail. He clarifies that the process of birth is the same for all. Undoubtedly, Allah says that He has created two classes of human being—male and female—to carry on the lineage in a fine manner. According to the *Qur'an*, the important feature of the process of birth is that it casts substantial light on the truth. Moreover, the *Qur'an* warns the people saying thus:

*Does man think
That he will be left
Uncontrolled (without purpose)
Was he not a drop
Of sperm emitted
(In lowly form).?
Then did he become
A leach like clot;
Then did (Allah) make*

*And fashion (him)
In due proportion.
And of him He made
Two sexes Male and Female
Has not He, (the same),
The power to give life
To the dead?*

- *Al-Qiyamah*, 36-38 (*Al-Qur'an*)

This verse brings out the truth in a way not found in other religions. The 'death', no doubt, is accepted in all the religions. But this verse refutes the controversial opinions and facts about the death as held in other religions. This verse highlights the truth that 'the death is inevitable and after death, everybody will have to face the judgement of Allah. Nobody can get exemption from this rule whatsoever his status is'. But the *Purush Sukta* provides immunity to the Brahmins. Thus, it is clear that the *Qur'an* has not divided the human beings into different social classes (except classification in gender, i.e. male and female) whereas the *Vedas* have divided them into different castes and sub-castes, and consequently, filled them with the feelings of dissatisfaction, negligence and inferiority.

As we are debating on who a Brahmin is, we are trying our best to bring out the truth. For this purpose we have presented some illustrations from the *Purush Sukta* and other Hindu scriptures. On the basis of these illustrations we have come to know that there are deep contradictions in these books on the subject. The *Smritis* prove that 'Nobody can be a Brahmin by birth'. When nobody is a Brahmin by birth, how can the society accept his supremacy? How can we get the solutions of these contradictions? Why are these contradictions part of the Hindu religious books? The present illustrations of the *Smriti* are also supported by other Hindu scriptures. After all, why do they speak like that? Because of these contradictions and confusions, the *Vedas* find themselves in a very ridiculous position. As a result, this not only puts a question mark over the supremacy

*Man We did create
 from a quintessence (of clay),
 Then We placed him
 As (a drop of) sperm
 In a place of rest,
 Firmly fixed,
 Then We made the sperm
 Into a clot of congealed blood;
 Then of that clot We made
 A (foetus) lump; then We
 Made out of that lump
 Bones and clothed the bones
 With flesh; then We developed
 Out of it another creator
 So blessed be Allah,
 The best to create!*

- *Al-Muminoon*, 12-14 (*Al-Qur'an*)

In this verse, Allah says about the birth of a child in detail. He clarifies that the process of birth is the same for all. Undoubtedly, Allah says that He has created two classes of human being—male and female—to carry on the lineage in a fine manner. According to the *Qur'an*, the important feature of the process of birth is that it casts substantial light on the truth. Moreover, the *Qur'an* warns the people saying thus:

*Does man think
 That he will be left
 Uncontrolled (without purpose)
 Was he not a drop
 Of sperm emitted
 (In lowly form).?
 Then did he become
 A leach like clot;
 Then did (Allah) make*

*And fashion (him)
 In due proportion.
 And of him He made
 Two sexes Male and Female
 Has not He, (the same),
 The power to give life
 To the dead?*

- *Al-Qiyamah*, 36-38 (*Al-Qur'an*)

This verse brings out the truth in a way not found in other religions. The 'death', no doubt, is accepted in all the religions. But this verse refutes the controversial opinions and facts about the death as held in other religions. This verse highlights the truth that 'the death is inevitable and after death, everybody will have to face the judgement of Allah. Nobody can get exemption from this rule whatsoever his status is'. But the *Purush Sukta* provides immunity to the Brahmins. Thus, it is clear that the *Qur'an* has not divided the human beings into different social classes (except classification in gender, i.e. male and female) whereas the *Vedas* have divided them into different castes and sub-castes, and consequently, filled them with the feelings of dissatisfaction, negligence and inferiority.

As we are debating on who a Brahmin is, we are trying our best to bring out the truth. For this purpose we have presented some illustrations from the *Purush Sukta* and other Hindu scriptures. On the basis of these illustrations we have come to know that there are deep contradictions in these books on the subject. The *Smritis* prove that 'Nobody can be a Brahmin by birth'. When nobody is a Brahmin by birth, how can the society accept his supremacy? How can we get the solutions of these contradictions? Why are these contradictions part of the Hindu religious books? The present illustrations of the *Smriti* are also supported by other Hindu scriptures. After all, why do they speak like that? Because of these contradictions and confusions, the *Vedas* find themselves in a very ridiculous position. As a result, this not only puts a question mark over the supremacy

of Brahmins, but also points out that the violation of religious propriety is not more than a play in Hinduism. In this context, Buddha Charit too repudiates the Purush Sukta and says, 'No, the Brahmin is not superior by birth, but he gets Brahminism by virtue of his deeds. His birth from the mouth of Brahma and his supremacy on this basis cannot be accepted.' Thus says the Buddha Charita:

*Jato vyusatu kaivartya shwapakyashcha parasharah
Shukya shakah kanadkhayastoyolukya suto bhawatah.
Mrigi joarhashshringoapce vashishtho ganceka
tamazah.*

- Buddha Charita - 9/9

That is "Vyas was born in the Kaivartya caste, Rishi Parashar was born to a dog eater, Rishi Shak was born to a Shukya and so was Keshpingal to Uluki. Rishi Shringi was born to a doe and so was Vyas to a Ganika."

The facts emanating from the above-mentioned verse suggests that for becoming a Brahmin, the birth in a Brahmin family is not a necessity. Therefore, Buddha Charita rejects the principle of the Purush Sukta. The rejection of the Purush Sukta is important because the Hindu scriptures are refuting the order of Brahma, the creator of the universe. If we throw light on Buddha Charit it comes out that there is no one fit for Brahminism. Even the procedure of birth, described in it, seems impossible. If a man achieves Brahminism by virtue of his knowledge, irrespective of his unnatural birth, what is the usefulness of the notion that the man can be a Brahmin only by birth? Vyas and Parashar are recognised as highly respectable Rishis. All the more, Vashistha achieved the position of Ayodhya's royal preceptor (Rajguru). Thus, this is not at all logical to say that the Brahmins were created from the mouth of Brahma. This fact gets the support as Rishi Vyas, an important character of the Mahabharat, was not born from the mouth of Brahma, but from the womb of a Shudra woman. If the Brahmasutra was followed, Vyas could not

be a Brahmin. According to the Brahmasutra, he was not entitled even to read the scriptures. But the facts are fuxtapposite. He proved himself not only as an important character of Mahabharat but also as an author of eighteen Puranas. Why? This clearly proves that the religious guidelines prescribed by the Purush Suktas are woefully untrue.

A well-known character of the Mahabharat is Dronacharya. He was an expert not only in weaponry, but also a highly reputed teacher of this art. During the period of Mahabharat, imparting education in weaponry as well as in religious treatise was the chief pre-occupation of the Brahmins. But like the Smritis, Shiv Dharm Samhita mentions about the unnatural birth of Dronacharya. It says thus:

Tasmachcha kalshajjato droonah shustramritam varam.

- Sheeva Dharm Samhita - 12/76

That is, "Dronacharya was born of a pot."

This verse also suggests that Dronacharya was born neither from the mouth of Brahma, nor was he a Brahmin by birth. But he established himself as an influential Brahmin. Therefore, for Brahminism, according to the Shiv-Dharma Samhita, neither the birth from Brahma's mouth, nor birth in a Brahmin family is a pre-condition.

Vrihad Devata Dharma Samhita also rejects the principle of the Purush Sukta. It says thus :

Shudri garbhsamut pannah kusheekashch mahamuni.

- Vrihad Devta - 4/98

of Brahmins, but also points out that the violation of religious propriety is not more than a play in Hinduism. In this context, Buddha Charit too repudiates the Purush Sukta and says, 'No, the Brahmin is not superior by birth, but he gets Brahminism by virtue of his deeds. His birth from the mouth of Brahma and his supremacy on this basis cannot be accepted.' Thus says the Buddha Charita:

*Jato vyusatu kaivartya shwapakyashcha parasharah
Shukya shakah kanadkhayastoyolukya suto bhawatah.
Mrigi joarthashshringoapce vashishtho ganceka
tamazah.*

- Buddha Charita - 9/9

That is "Vyas was born in the Kaivartya caste, Rishi Parashar was born to a dog eater, Rishi Shak was born to a Shukya and so was Keshpingal to Uluki. Rishi Shringi was born to a doe and so was Vyas to a Ganika."

The facts emanating from the above-mentioned verse suggests that for becoming a Brahmin, the birth in a Brahmin family is not a necessity. Therefore, Buddha Charita rejects the principle of the Purush Sukta. The rejection of the Purush Sukta is important because the Hindu scriptures are refuting the order of Brahma, the creator of the universe. If we throw light on Buddha Charit it comes out that there is no one fit for Brahminism. Even the procedure of birth, described in it, seems impossible. If a man achieves Brahminism by virtue of his knowledge, irrespective of his unnatural birth, what is the usefulness of the notion that the man can be a Brahmin only by birth? Vyas and Parashar are recognised as highly respectable Rishis. All the more, Vashistha achieved the position of Ayodhya's royal preceptor (Rajguru). Thus, this is not at all logical to say that the Brahmins were created from the mouth of Brahma. This fact gets the support as Rishi Vyas, an important character of the Mahabharat, was not born from the mouth of Brahma, but from the womb of a Shudra woman. If the Brahmasutra was followed, Vyas could not

be a Brahmin. According to the Brahmasutra, he was not entitled even to read the scriptures. But the facts are fuxtapposite. He proved himself not only as an important character of Mahabharat but also as an author of eighteen Puranas. Why? This clearly proves that the religious guidelines prescribed by the Purush Suktas are woefully untrue.

A well-known character of the Mahabharat is Dronacharya. He was an expert not only in weaponry, but also a highly reputed teacher of this art. During the period of Mahabharat, imparting education in weaponry as well as in religious treatise was the chief pre-occupation of the Brahmins. But like the Smritis, Shiv Dharm Samhita mentions about the unnatural birth of Dronacharya. It says thus:

Tasmachcha kalshajjato droonah shustramritam varam.

- Sheeva Dharm Samhita - 12/76

That is, "Dronacharya was born of a pot."

This verse also suggests that Dronacharya was born neither from the mouth of Brahma, nor was he a Brahmin by birth. But he established himself as an influential Brahmin. Therefore, for Brahminism, according to the Shiv-Dharma Samhita, neither the birth from Brahma's mouth, nor birth in a Brahmin family is a precondition.

Vrihad Devata Dharma Samhita also rejects the principle of the Purush Sukta. It says thus :

Shudri garbhsamut pannah kusheekashch mahamuni.

- Vrihad Devta - 4/98

That is, "The great hermit, Kushik, was born from the womb of a Shudra woman". The son of a Shudra woman achieved the distinction of 'Mahamuni' i.e., the best among saints. Therefore, the notion of supremacy based on the birth in a particular caste is completely falsified by Vrihad Devata.

When it is proved that no one is a Brahmin by birth, the Brahminical forces put forward their arguments in this way- 'the mother can be a non-Brahmin, but if she gives birth to a child with the womb of a Brahmin father, the child is recognised as a Brahmin'. If this is the case then the children born of a union of a Brahmin father and a slave mother should be entitled to Brahminism. But this is not acceptable to the Brahmins. If we accept, for the sake of argument, that only the son of a Brahmin father is a Brahmin, then there will be a dearth of Brahmins, for the paternity is always in doubt. There are several examples of adultery undertaken by Brahmin women with the men of other castes. In such a case, a person cannot be a Brahmin by birth. This is also supported by Manav Dharm :

*Sadhah patati mansen lakshya lavnen cha
Tryahachchhudrashch bhavati bramhanah kshurvikrju.
Akashagaamino viprah patantu mansbhkshnaat
Vipranaam pattanam dristwa tatoo mansani varjyet.*

- Manav Dharm

That is, "A Brahmin, who sells meat, lac and salt, is a outcaste from Brahminism. A Brahmin, who sells milk, gets the position of a Shudra within three days. A Brahmin, notwithstanding his power to fly in the sky by virtue of his yoga, gets denigration from Brahminism, if he eats meat. Therefore, keeping in mind their denigration, the Brahmins should abandon meat-eating."

The above verse describes in detail how a Brahmin gets denigration from Brahminism, if he does some non-Brahminical deeds. But

if we analyse the Manusmriti, Yagyavalkya and the Vashistha Samhita, we are left with no option but to treat them wrong. The Rigveda approves the meat-eating in this way :

*Ukshnaaya vashannaya somprishthaya vedhse
Sttomaiveerdhe magnye.*

- Rigveda; 8/43/11

That is, "Whose grains are acceptable and the sacrificial meat of a barren cow is eatable..." This verse clearly suggests that the Brahmins used to eat the meat, because it was only the Brahmins who were entitled to eat the materials offered to the gods. Was it possible that they used to eat all the things offered to the gods, but not the meat? Therefore, the instructions of Manusmriti, Yagyavalkya and the Vashistha Samhita about meat-eating are neither logical nor acceptable. Manu himself says in Manusmriti :

Proksheetam bhakshyenmansam bramhna ch kamyaya.

- Manusmriti; 5/27

That is, "The Brahmins should eat the meat of animals purified by the mantras". Presenting the controversial statements in the same book, 'Manusmriti', Manu actually created confusion about meat-eating. Therefore, neither the notion of Brahmin's birth from the mouth of Brahma, nor Manu's principle of meat-eating are acceptable.

The Smritis also played very important role in spreading the confusion. On the one hand, they speak that a son of a Shudra woman and Brahmin man was recognised as a Brahmin, but on the other hand, they recognised the son of a Brahmin woman and a Shudra man as a Chandala. The illustrations of the Smritis clearly suggest that the Brahmin women had illicit relations with the Shudra men. And the most important proof in the support of this fact is Maharshi

Vishwamitra who was born of a Chandala woman. Although the son of a Chandala woman, according to the Smritis, cannot be a Brahmin, but this is a well-known fact that Vishwamitra was admitted to the Brahmin fold and his praise in the Hindu scriptures is not a secret. In this way, the Smritis augmented the confusion.

When we analyse the Manav Dharm, we come to know that nobody is a Brahmin by birth. If this was not the case, how could a Brahmin get the status of a Shudra because of his non-Brahminical deeds. As a horse cannot be a boar because of some vices in him, on the same ground a Brahmin by birth cannot be a Shudra. It is, therefore, proved that no one is Brahmin by birth.

Now an important question is : Is the body a Brahmin? This question is important because with the resolution of this question many false notions of Hinduism will receive their end. Thus says the Manav Dharm:

Shareeramabee bramhno na bhawatee ?

*Yodi sharuram bramhnan syat tarhee pawkoapee
bramnaha syad .*

Bramhatya cha vandhunam shareedahna dam ved.

*Bramhana sharur nishyandjatushch kshatriya vaishya
shudra abi bramhna saynh.*

Na chait dristtam.

*Bramhna sarur venashachcha yaznayajana dhayyana
adhayya pandan parti garahadeena bramhan
sarurjaitana falasya venashah sayat.*

Na chaitdristtam.

Atto manyamahe shareeramabee bramhno na bhaulati

- Manav Dharm

That is, "If the body is a Brahmin, the Agni will get the sin of 'brahma hatya' (Slaughter of a Brahmin), because it cremates the body. (Agni is a well-known God of the Vedas. He is mentioned in

the Vedas more than Brahma and Vishnu). If the body is a Brahmin, then all the children born of the unions of Brahmin fathers and non-Brahmin mothers should be Brahmins. But this is not in practice. If the body is a Brahmin, all the virtuous deeds performed by him should end with the end of that body. But this is not accepted. Therefore, we have to accept that the body is not a Brahmin.

Bhavishya Puran also agrees with the Manav Dharma. Thus says the Bhavishya Puran:

Prithivyudakvayavagni parinama vishishatah

Dehatam sarvbhutanam bramhatwa prasangatah

*... Tasmanan dehe bramhnayam nabee dehatamakam
bhawet*

Varnapasad chandalswa dadunam prasjyattu

Yadi dehsya veepratam bhavvidarapagamyattu.

- Bhavishya Puran: 41/53-56

Therefore, Bhavishya Puran too does not accept the body as a Brahmin.

This is a well-known fact that Brahmin men and women had illicit relations with non-Brahmin women and men and the sons born of their union also came to be known as Brahmins. As for example, Mahidas was born of the union of Rishi Mandhuki with a Shudra woman, called Itara. But by virtue of his penance he got Brahminism. That is why he was named as 'Mahidas Aitareya' after her mother.

Mahidas Aitareya was a Vedic scholar and he authored the Brahmin and Aranyaka scriptures. Not only this, a lineage of Brahmins, called Aitareya Brahmin, was started after him. Therefore, to say that only those who get birth from Brahma's mouth are Brahmins holds no water. For references, we can study Aitareya Aranyak (2.1.8), Chhando Upanishad (3.16.7) and Jaimini Upanishad (4.2.21).

Vishwamitra who was born of a Chandala woman. Although the son of a Chandala woman, according to the Smritis, cannot be a Brahmin, but this is a well-known fact that Vishwamitra was admitted to the Brahmin fold and his praise in the Hindu scriptures is not a secret. In this way, the Smritis augmented the confusion.

When we analyse the Manav Dharm, we come to know that nobody is a Brahmin by birth. If this was not the case, how could a Brahmin get the status of a Shudra because of his non-Brahminical deeds. As a horse cannot be a boar because of some vices in him, on the same ground a Brahmin by birth cannot be a Shudra. It is, therefore, proved that no one is Brahmin by birth.

Now an important question is : Is the body a Brahmin? This question is important because with the resolution of this question many false notions of Hinduism will receive their end. Thus says the Manav Dharm:

Shareeramabee bramhno na bhawatee ?

*Yodi sharuram bramhnan syat tarhee pawkoapee
bramhaha syad .*

Bramhatya cha vandhunam shareedahna dam ved.

*Bramhana sharur nishyandjatushch kshatriya vaishya
shudra abi bramhna saynh.*

Na chait dristtam.

*Bramhna sarur venashachcha yaznayajana dhayyana
adhayya pandan parti garahadeena bramhan
sarurjaitana falasya venashah sayat.*

Na chaitdristtam.

Atto manyamahe shareeramabee bramhno na bhaulati

- Manav Dharm

That is, "If the body is a Brahmin, the Agni will get the sin of 'brahma hatya' (Slaughter of a Brahmin), because it cremates the body. (Agni is a well-known God of the Vedas. He is mentioned in

the Vedas more than Brahma and Vishnu). If the body is a Brahmin, then all the children born of the unions of Brahmin fathers and non-Brahmin mothers should be Brahmins. But this is not in practice. If the body is a Brahmin, all the virtuous deeds performed by him should end with the end of that body. But this is not accepted. Therefore, we have to accept that the body is not a Brahmin.

Bhavishya Puran also agrees with the Manav Dharma. Thus says the Bhavishya Puran:

Prithivyudakvayavagni parinama vishishatah

Dehatam sarvbhutanam bramhatwa prasangatah

*... Tasmanan dehe bramhnayam nabee dehatamakam
bhawet*

Varnapasad chandalswa dadunam prasjyattu

Yadi dehsya veepratam bhavvidarapagamyattu.

- Bhavishya Puran: 41/53-56

Therefore, Bhavishya Puran too does not accept the body as a Brahmin.

This is a well-known fact that Brahmin men and women had illicit relations with non-Brahmin women and men and the sons born of their union also came to be known as Brahmins. As for example, Mahidas was born of the union of Rishi Mandhuki with a Shudra woman, called Itara. But by virtue of his penance he got Brahminism. That is why he was named as 'Mahidas Aitareya' after her mother.

Mahidas Aitareya was a Vedic scholar and he authored the Brahmin and Aranyaka scriptures. Not only this, a lineage of Brahmins, called Aitareya Brahmin, was started after him. Therefore, to say that only those who get birth from Brahma's mouth are Brahmins holds no water. For references, we can study Aitareya Aranyak (2.1.8), Chhando Upanishad (3.16.7) and Jaimini Upanishad (4.2.21).

As the second example, we can name Rishi Matang. About his birth, there is a hearsay that he was born to a Brahmin mother by her union with a non-Brahmin man. For support, we can refer to Anushasan Parva of the Mahabharat (27-29).

Another example of illegitimate sons is Narad, popularly known as 'Manas Putra' (adopted son) of Brahma. Narad is also regarded as an incarnation of Vishnu (Shrimad Bhagwat 1.3.8 and Matsya Puran 3.6.8). Narad was born to the Shudra parents- Dramil and his wife Kalavati (Vishnu Puran 1-15). How was Narad, a son of the Shudra parents, come to be known as a Brahmin? All the more, he is called the 'Manas Putra' of Brahma. Now question arises as why did Brahma, who divided the society into four varnas and accorded Brahmins with the supremacy choose a Shudra to adopt as his Manas Putra? If Brahma can establish his Shudra-son in the category of gods, then what is the need to impose the condition that only those who get birth from Brahma's mouth can become Brahmins? Obviously, the logic of this double-standard is neither available in the Vedas nor in the other religious scriptures. Such contradictions take an ugly turn when the established norms are violated by the creator of the universe. In such circumstances not only Brahma, but also all the religious scriptures come under the dark shade of doubt.

Is the knowledge a Brahmin? As the Brahmins are described as synonym of knowledge in the Hindu scriptures, this is necessary to debate on whether one can achieve Brahminism by virtue of his knowledge. But when we study the Vedic scriptures, it comes into light that "one cannot become a Brahmin merely by virtue of his knowledge". If this was the case, all the Shudra scholars might have become Brahmins. There were a number of Shudras who had in-depth knowledge of scriptures, science, grammar, mimansa, etc., but they were not accorded with Brahminism. Therefore, this is very much clear that one cannot claim to be a Brahmin on the basis of his knowledge. Thus is said in the Brahmin Granth:

*Bramhatwam na shastrena na sanskaraina jalibhi
Na kulea na vedu na karmana bhavetatan.*

That is, "Brahminism is neither achieved by the knowledge of religious scriptures, nor by rituals, birth, reading of the Vedas and deeds."

Therefore, to say that one is a Brahmin by birth is not acceptable. In support of this fact, there are several illustrations in the Mahabharat (Anushasan Parva 143/50), the Harivansh Puran (29/8), the Vishnu Puran (4/8/1) and the Vayu Puran (2/30/4). When these scriptures have refuted the logic of Brahminism based on birth, why should we accept that the son of a Brahmin is a Brahmin and he is accorded with the highest respect? The repudiation of Purush Sukta by the other Hindu treatise is an example in itself. This also poses a challenge to the Rigveda, which is rightly called the mother of contradictions. Whether the Rigveda, which has created a rift among the human beings, serves any useful purpose in Hinduism is still doubtful.

Now, the question arises: who is a Brahmin? For the answer of this question I studied in-depth all the Hindu scriptures from the Vedas to the religious jurisprudences, but all in vain. On this subject all the Hindu scriptures are deeply ridden with contradictions. These religious books seem to repudiate their own arguments. As a result, the subject in question still remains unanswered.

I think the most appropriate answer of this question is given by Ashwaghosh. He says:

*Nirmamo nirankaro nihsango nishaparigrah.
Ragd weshavinir mukatastam deva bramhinam viduh.*

- Ashwaghosh - 14

That is, "A person, who is far from selfishness, affection, ego,

As the second example, we can name Rishi Matang. About his birth, there is a hearsay that he was born to a Brahmin mother by her union with a non-Brahmin man. For support, we can refer to Anushasan Parva of the Mahabharat (27-29).

Another example of illegitimate sons is Narad, popularly known as 'Manas Putra' (adopted son) of Brahma. Narad is also regarded as an incarnation of Vishnu (Shrimad Bhagwat 1.3.8 and Matsya Puran 3.6.8). Narad was born to the Shudra parents- Dramil and his wife Kalavati (Vishnu Puran 1-15). How was Narad, a son of the Shudra parents, come to be known as a Brahmin? All the more, he is called the 'Manas Putra' of Brahma. Now question arises as why did Brahma, who divided the society into four varnas and accorded Brahmins with the supremacy choose a Shudra to adopt as his Manas Putra? If Brahma can establish his Shudra-son in the category of gods, then what is the need to impose the condition that only those who get birth from Brahma's mouth can become Brahmins? Obviously, the logic of this double-standard is neither available in the Vedas nor in the other religious scriptures. Such contradictions take an ugly turn when the established norms are violated by the creator of the universe. In such circumstances not only Brahma, but also all the religious scriptures come under the dark shade of doubt.

Is the knowledge a Brahmin? As the Brahmins are described as synonym of knowledge in the Hindu scriptures, this is necessary to debate on whether one can achieve Brahminism by virtue of his knowledge. But when we study the Vedic scriptures, it comes into light that "one cannot become a Brahmin merely by virtue of his knowledge". If this was the case, all the Shudra scholars might have become Brahmins. There were a number of Shudras who had in-depth knowledge of scriptures, science, grammar, mimansa, etc., but they were not accorded with Brahminism. Therefore, this is very much clear that one cannot claim to be a Brahmin on the basis of his knowledge. Thus is said in the Brahmin Granth :

*Bramhatwam na shastrena na sanskaraina jalibhi
Na kulea na vedeu na karmana bhavetatan.*

That is, "Brahminism is neither achieved by the knowledge of religious scriptures, nor by rituals, birth, reading of the Vedas and deeds."

Therefore, to say that one is a Brahmin by birth is not acceptable. In support of this fact, there are several illustrations in the Mahabharat (Anushasan Parva 143/50), the Harivansh Puran (29/8), the Vishnu Puran (4/8/1) and the Vayu Puran (2/30/4). When these scriptures have refuted the logic of Brahminism based on birth, why should we accept that the son of a Brahmin is a Brahmin and he is accorded with the highest respect? The repudiation of Purush Sukta by the other Hindu treatise is an example in itself. This also poses a challenge to the Rigveda, which is rightly called the mother of contradictions. Whether the Rigveda, which has created a rift among the human beings, serves any useful purpose in Hinduism is still doubtful.

Now, the question arises : who is a Brahmin? For the answer of this question I studied in-depth all the Hindu scriptures from the Vedas to the religious jurisprudences, but all in vain. On this subject all the Hindu scriptures are deeply ridden with contradictions. These religious books seem to repudiate their own arguments. As a result, the subject in question still remains unanswered.

I think the most appropriate answer of this question is given by Ashwaghosh. He says :

*Nirmamo nirankaro nihsango nishaparigrah.
Ragd weshavinir mukatastam deva bramhinam viduh.*

- Ashwaghosh - 14

That is, "A person, who is far from selfishness, affection, ego,

infatuation, desires, love and hatred, is called a Brahmin by the gods." These conditions for becoming a Brahmin are also described in the Bhagwat Gita (18/42), Bhagwat (7/11/21; 11/17/16), Mahabharat Vanparva (180/21), Narad Paribrajakopanishad (3/6), Kundikopanishad (917), Atmanopanishad (911), The Bhagwat Gita (2/71, 12/13), Mahabharat Anushasanparva (108/5), Mahabharat Ashwa (46/45-46, 47/9, 15) and Vrihaspati Vachanam (89). The above illustrations suggest that a person, who fulfils these conditions, is entitled to be regarded as a Brahmin. A person, who does not fulfill these conditions, but is born in a Brahmin family, cannot be a Brahmin.

In this context thus is said the theological jurisprudences :

Satyam bramh tapo bramh bramh chenidryanigrah
Sarva bhooti daya bramha cltad bramhi lakshnam .
Satyam nasti tapo nasti nasti chenidryanigrah
Sarva bhooti daya nasti etchchandal lakshanam.
Deva manush narinam triyagyonigtishwapee
Mathunam nadhigachchhanti te veeprasti cha bramhina.
Na jatidrishyati tawad gunah kalyankarkah
Chandaloakee ki trasthastam deva bramhinam veedoh.

- Dharm Shastra

- Shukraniti - 1/18

That is, "The truth is a Brahmin; the penance is a Brahmin; the suppression of senses (sensual pleasures) is a Brahmin, and a person, who has compassion for all living beings, is a Brahmin. All these are characteristics of a Brahmin. To tell a lie, not to penance, submission to senses (sensual pleasures) and cruelty are the characteristics of a 'Chandal'. All the gods, men, women, animals and birds, who have renounced the sensual and materialistic pleasures, can be the Brahmins. The renunciation of worldly passions symbolises the Brahminism." On this subject Shukraniti says, "The virtue, not

the caste, of a man is beneficial. Even a Chandal was accepted as a Brahmin by the gods, if he possessed the virtues of a Brahmin."

Therefore, to say that only a person who is born from the mouth of Brahma is a Brahmin is neither true nor logical. One condition among the others for becoming a Brahmin is the suppression of sensual pleasures. But as the controversy is the inherent feature of the Hinduism, the pre-conditions for Brahminhood too attract a controversy. This is a well-established fact that Vishwamitra was a highly esteemed Brahmin. But when we test him with the special reference to his relationship with Menaka in the light of the above-mentioned condition for Brahminism, i.e. suppression of passions, we find that he could not control his senses. According to this condition, he should be expelled from Brahminism. But this did not happen. We can cite another example of Rishi Parashar who succumbed to his sexual desire with the young daughter of a boatman. He too was not expelled from Brahminism. These illustrations pin point the differences amongst the Hindu theological jurisprudences.

However, the Mahabharat (Shantiparva, 190/1), Vayu Puran (8/163), Atri (374), Vyas Vachanavi (37) and the Bhavishya Puran (Pratisarga, Khand four) also accept the conditions for Brahminism propounded by the theological jurisprudence (Dharm Shastra) and the Shukraniti. Therefore, for becoming a Brahmin neither the caste, soul and body, nor the knowledge and occupation are compulsory, as described by the Vedas. The Vedas say that the renunciation (Sanyas) is not allowed for the Shudras. Their only duty and religion is the Hindu service for the Brahmins. They are considered as the lowest by the Hindu scriptures. That is why, they are counted at the last of the four varnas.

If the sequence is the scale to measure one's status, then the Indra should be termed as a Shudra because in a mantra of Panini — 'Shva-yuva-madhonamatasiddha, iti (6/4/133)' he (Indra) is mentioned at the end of the verse. In this verse a dog (shva) is mentioned

infatuation, desires, love and hatred, is called a Brahmin by the gods." These conditions for becoming a Brahmin are also described in the Bhagwat Gita (18/42), Bhagwat (7/11/21; 11/17/16), Mahabharat Vanparva (180/21), Narad Paribrajakopanishad (3/6), Kundikopanishad (917), Atmanopanishad (911), The Bhagwat Gita (2/71, 12/13), Mahabharat Anushasanparva (108/5), Mahabharat Ashwa (46/45-46, 47/9, 15) and Vrihaspati Vachanam (89). The above illustrations suggest that a person, who fulfils these conditions, is entitled to be regarded as a Brahmin. A person, who does not fulfill these conditions, but is born in a Brahmin family, cannot be a Brahmin.

In this context thus is said the theological jurisprudences :

*Satyam bramh tapo bramh bramh chenidryanigrah
Sarva bhooti daya bramha cltad bramhi lakshnam .
Satyam nasti tapo nasti nasti chenidryanigrah
Sarva bhooti daya nasti etchchandal lakshanam.
Deva manush narinam triyagyonigtishwapee
Mathunam nadhigachchhanti te veeprasti cha bramhina.
Na jatidrishyati tawad gunah kalyankarkah
Chandaloakee ki trashastam deva bramhinam veedoh.*

- Dharm Shastra
- Shukraniti - 1/18

That is, "The truth is a Brahmin; the penance is a Brahmin; the suppression of senses (sensual pleasures) is a Brahmin, and a person, who has compassion for all living beings, is a Brahmin. All these are characteristics of a Brahmin. To tell a lie, not to penance, submission to senses (sensual pleasures) and cruelty are the characteristics of a 'Chandal'. All the gods, men, women, animals and birds, who have renounced the sensual and materialistic pleasures, can be the Brahmins. The renunciation of worldly passions symbolises the Brahminism." On this subject Shukraniti says, "The virtue, not

the caste, of a man is beneficial. Even a Chandal was accepted as a Brahmin by the gods, if he possessed the virtues of a Brahmin."

Therefore, to say that only a person who is born from the mouth of Brahma is a Brahmin is neither true nor logical. One condition among the others for becoming a Brahmin is the suppression of sensual pleasures. But as the controversy is the inherent feature of the Hinduism, the pre-conditions for Brahminhood too attract a controversy. This is a well-established fact that Vishwamitra was a highly esteemed Brahmin. But when we test him with the special reference to his relationship with Menaka in the light of the above-mentioned condition for Brahminism, i.e. suppression of passions, we find that he could not control his senses. According to this condition, he should be expelled from Brahminism. But this did not happen. We can cite another example of Rishi Parashar who succumbed to his sexual desire with the young daughter of a boatman. He too was not expelled from Brahminism. These illustrations pin point the differences amongst the Hindu theological jurisprudences.

However, the Mahabharat (Shantiparva, 190/1), Vayu Puran (8/163), Atri (374), Vyas Vachanavi (37) and the Bhavishya Puran (Pratisarga, Khand four) also accept the conditions for Brahminism propounded by the theological jurisprudence (Dharm Shastra) and the Shukraniti. Therefore, for becoming a Brahmin neither the caste, soul and body, nor the knowledge and occupation are compulsory, as described by the Vedas. The Vedas say that the renunciation (Sanyas) is not allowed for the Shudras. Their only duty and religion is the Hindu service for the Brahmins. They are considered as the lowest by the Hindu scriptures. That is why, they are counted at the last of the four varnas.

If the sequence is the scale to measure one's status, then the Indra should be termed as a Shudra because in a mantra of Panini — 'Shva-yuva-madhonamatasiddha, iti (6/4/133)' he (Indra) is mentioned at the end of the verse. In this verse a dog (shva) is mentioned

first, then comes a man (yuva); and at last Indra (Madhavan) is mentioned. Therefore, this is not logical to say that a Shudra's only duty is the service of Brahmins.

If the controversy of Brahminism has no solution, then we should, first of all, redefine the Purush Sukta of the Rigveda. We must change the value of its meaning. Thus says in the Manav Dharm :

*Vreelifen peetsya nih shwapo pahatsya cha
Tatrair cha prasootsya nishkritinorpalabhyati.
Shadra hasten yo bhuktam masmekam nirantaram
Jeevomano bhawe chchudroo mritah shwanashcha jayti.
Shudree parivreeto veeprah shudri cha grihmeghi
Varjittah pitrideven rauram soadhigachehli.*

- Manav Dharm
- Manusmriti - 3/19
- Angiras - 1/48
- Apastamb - 8/7
- Vyas - 4/67
- Mahabharat, Anushasanparv - 47/9

That is, "A Brahmin, who sleeps with a Shudra woman, has sexual intercourse with her, kisses her cheeks and lips and creates progeny from her, declines from the Brahminism. And there is no atonement for such a sin. A Brahmin, who uses to eat food, prepared by a Shudra woman, continuously for one month, becomes a dog. A Brahmin, who is surrounded by Shudra women and his wife too is a Shudra, is denied to perform religious rituals for gods and ancestors. Such a Brahmin, after his death, goes to Raurav (one of the twenty one hells described in the Hinduism) hell."

The Manusmriti (3/19, 3/17-18), Angiras (1/48), Apastamb Grihsutra (8/7), Vyas (4/67, 4/68) and the Mahabharat Anushasan

Parva (47/9) also support the above-mentioned directions. But there are some examples when these directions were violated grossly. What punishment should be inflicted on Brahma for his adultery with his own daughter? In which gene should Vishnu take birth for his sin of having intercourse with Vranda? What punishment should be given to Krishna, who stole the clothes of Gopis bathing naked in the river Yamuna? What is the penal code of the Hindu scriptures for Krishna, who committed sexual intercourse with Kubja? (Shrimadbhagavad 10/48). What punishment should the Hindu scriptures inflict on Indra who committed adultery with Ahalya, the wife of Gautam Rishi? What will you term the deeds of Brahma, Vishnu and Mahesh (Shiva), who tried to molest the chastity of Anusuya? A few to mention, the list of such examples is very long.

Therefore, in the light of the above illustrations a fact emerges that the controversy over the Brahminism is endless. Even a Shudra can become a Brahmin. But to know how and why, we have to analyse the Manav Dharma. Thus says the Manav Dharm :

*Arnee garva sambhootah kathoo nam mahamuni
Tapsa brahmino jaatastsmajjatirkaranam.
Kaiwarti garva sambhootoo vyaso nam mahamuni
Tapsa brahmino jaatastsmajjatirkaranam.
Urvashree garva sambhootoo vasishathoabee mahamuni
Tapsa brahmino jaatastsmajjatirkaranam.
Hirnni garva sambhootoo shrishya shringano
mahamuni
Tapsa brahmino jaatastsmajjatirkaranam.
Chandali garva sambhootoo vishwamitro mahamuni
Tapsa brahmino jaatastsmajjatirkaranam.
Tandoolu garva sambhootoo nardo hi mahamuni
Tapsa brahmino jaatastsmajjatirkaranam.*

- Manav Dharm
- Bhavishya Puran - 42/26-30
- Bhagwat - 1/3/6-7

first, then comes a man (yuva); and at last Indra (Madhavan) is mentioned. Therefore, this is not logical to say that a Shudra's only duty is the service of Brahmins.

If the controversy of Brahminism has no solution, then we should, first of all, redefine the Purush Sukta of the Rigveda. We must change the value of its meaning. Thus says in the Manav Dharm :

*Vreelifen peetsya nih shwapo pahatsya cha
Tatrair cha prasootsya nishkritinorpalabhyati.
Shadra hasten yo bhuktam masmekam nirantaram
Jeevomano bhawe chchudroo mritah shwanashcha jayti.
Shudree parivreeto veeprah shudri cha grihmeghi
Varjittah pitrideven rauram soadhigachehli.*

- Manav Dharm
- Manusmriti - 3/19
- Angiras - 1/48
- Apastamb - 8/7
- Vyas - 4/67
- Mahabharat, Anushasanparv - 47/9

That is, "A Brahmin, who sleeps with a Shudra woman, has sexual intercourse with her, kisses her cheeks and lips and creates progeny from her, declines from the Brahminism. And there is no atonement for such a sin. A Brahmin, who uses to eat food, prepared by a Shudra woman, continuously for one month, becomes a dog. A Brahmin, who is surrounded by Shudra women and his wife too is a Shudra, is denied to perform religious rituals for gods and ancestors. Such a Brahmin, after his death, goes to Raurav (one of the twenty one hells described in the Hinduism) hell."

The Manusmriti (3/19, 3/17-18), Angiras (1/48), Apastamb Grihsutra (8/7), Vyas (4/67, 4/68) and the Mahabharat Anushasan

Parva (47/9) also support the above-mentioned directions. But there are some examples when these directions were violated grossly. What punishment should be inflicted on Brahma for his adultery with his own daughter? In which gene should Vishnu take birth for his sin of having intercourse with Vranda? What punishment should be given to Krishna, who stole the clothes of Gopis bathing naked in the river Yamuna? What is the penal code of the Hindu scriptures for Krishna, who committed sexual intercourse with Kubja? (Shrimadbhagavad 10/48). What punishment should the Hindu scriptures inflict on Indra who committed adultery with Ahalya, the wife of Gautam Rishi? What will you term the deeds of Brahma, Vishnu and Mahesh (Shiva), who tried to molest the chastity of Anusuya? A few to mention, the list of such examples is very long.

Therefore, in the light of the above illustrations a fact emerges that the controversy over the Brahminism is endless. Even a Shudra can become a Brahmin. But to know how and why, we have to analyse the Manav Dharma. Thus says the Manav Dharm :

*Arnee garva sambhootah kathoo nam mahamuni
Tapsa brahmino jaatastmajjatirkaranam.
Kaiwarti garva sambhootoo vyaso nam mahamuni
Tapsa brahmino jaatastmajjatirkaranam.
Urvashee garva sambhootoo vasishathoabee mahamuni
Tapsa brahmino jaatastmajjatirkaranam.
Hirnni garva sambhootoo shrishya shringano
mahamuni
Tapsa brahmino jaatastmajjatirkaranam.
Chandali garva sambhootoo vishwamitro mahamuni
Tapsa brahmino jaatastmajjatirkaranam.
Tandoolu garva sambhootoo nardo hi mahamuni
Tapsa brahmino jaatastmajjatirkaranam.*

- Manav Dharm
- Bhavishya Puran - 42/26-30
- Bhagwat - 1/3/6-7

That is, "The great saint Kadh was born to Arani. He achieved the Brahminism by virtue of his penance. Therefore, the caste is not the factor for Brahminism."

"Maharshi Vyas, who wrote the Mahabharat and eighteen Purans, was born to Kaivarta. He too achieved Brahminism by his penance. Therefore, birth is not a factor for Brahminism."

"Mahamuni Vashishtha, an important character of the Ramayana and the preceptor of Ayodhya, was born to Urvashi (an apsara, who believed in free sex). But by virtue of his penance he too achieved Brahminism. Therefore, the birth is not a factor for Brahminism."

"The famous saint Srishya Shringa was born to a doe, but attained Brahminism by his severe penance. This proves that the birth is not a factor for Brahminism."

"Rishi Vishvamitra was born to a Chandal woman, but attained Brahminism by virtue of his penance. This is obvious that the birth is not a factor for Brahminism."

"Devarshi Narad was born to a maid-servant (dasi), who used to separate husk from rice. But banking on his penance he attained the Brahminism. He is popularly known as the 'Manav Putra' of Brahma. This also proves that the birth is not a factor for Brahminism."

Defining the Brahmin, Yatidharman, Brahmapuran and the Mahabharat say thus :

*Jittatma yalirbhawati jittatma cha jitendriya
Tapsa tapuso jaato bramhcharyin bramhamah.
Na cha te bramhin putraste cha lokasya bramhinah
Shee shocham cha te bramh tasmad kulam kuranam.
Sheelam pradhanam na kulam kulen kim sheel*

vivarditen

*Vahvo nara neech kula prasooteh swargah gatah
shulmupetya dheerah.*

- Manav Dharm, Yati Dharin - 33

- Mahabharat, Anushasan Parva - 143-52

- Mahabharat, Van Parva - 181/42-43

- Mrikshkatikam - 8/29

- Venisamhar - 3/38

That is, "A person, who controls his passions, is called a 'Jitendriya'. By virtue of his penance a man is called 'tapasvi'. Similarly, a person, who observe brahmacharya, is called a 'Brahmin'."

The above-mentioned Rishis (Kath, Vyas, etc.) were not born to the Brahmin mothers, but established themselves as esteemed Brahmins with their conduct and righteousness. Therefore, the birth is not a factor for Brahminism.

For the achievement of greatness, the birth in a reputed family is not a necessity, but what is important is moral conduct. There is no meaning of getting birth in a higher family, if he lacks morality and gentleness. There are numerous examples of scholars, who by virtue of their moral conduct commanded a great respect and attained the heaven, notwithstanding their births in lower castes. Therefore, the birth in a higher family is not a factor for achievement of greatness.

Therefore, the principle of varna-system, propounded in the Purush Sukta, holds no water. If we think logically, it comes into light that all are born of the same origin—that is Brahma. Now again a question. Are there different categories of Brahmins? If yes, are they the Brahmins who were created from the mouth of Brahma? Because we know a number of Brahmins who were not born from the

That is, "The great saint Kadh was born to Arani. He achieved the Brahminism by virtue of his penance. Therefore, the caste is not the factor for Brahminism."

"Maharshi Vyas, who wrote the Mahabharat and eighteen Purans, was born to Kaivarta. He too achieved Brahminism by his penance. Therefore, birth is not a factor for Brahminism."

"Mahamuni Vashishtha, an important character of the Ramayana and the preceptor of Ayodhya, was born to Urvashi (an apsara, who believed in free sex). But by virtue of his penance he too achieved Brahminism. Therefore, the birth is not a factor for Brahminism."

"The famous saint Srishya Shringa was born to a doe, but attained Brahminism by his severe penance. This proves that the birth is not a factor for Brahminism."

"Rishi Vishvamitra was born to a Chandal woman, but attained Brahminism by virtue of his penance. This is obvious that the birth is not a factor for Brahminism."

"Devarshi Narad was born to a maid-servant (dasi), who used to separate husk from rice. But banking on his penance he attained the Brahminism. He is popularly known as the 'Manav Putra' of Brahma. This also proves that the birth is not a factor for Brahminism."

Defining the Brahmin, Yatidharman, Brahmapuran and the Mahabharat say thus :

*Jittatma yalirbhawati jittatma cha jitendriya
Tapsa tapuso jaato bramhacharyin bramhamah.
Na cha te bramhin putraste cha lokasya bramhinah
Shee shocham cha te bramh tasmad kulam kuranam.
Sheelam pradhanam na kulam kulen kim sheel*

vivarditen

*Vahvo nara neech kula prasooteh swargah gatah
shulmupetya dheerah.*

- Manav Dharm, Yati Dharm - 33

- Mahabharat, Anushasan Parva - 143-52

- Mahabharat, Van Parva - 181/42-43

- Mrikshkatikam - 8/29

- Venisamhar - 3/38

That is, "A person, who controls his passions, is called a 'Jitendriya'. By virtue of his penance a man is called 'tapasvi'. Similarly, a person, who observe brahmacharya, is called a 'Brahmin'."

The above-mentioned Rishis (Kath, Vyas, etc.) were not born to the Brahmin mothers, but established themselves as esteemed Brahmins with their conduct and righteousness. Therefore, the birth is not a factor for Brahminism.

For the achievement of greatness, the birth in a reputed family is not a necessity, but what is important is moral conduct. There is no meaning of getting birth in a higher family, if he lacks morality and gentleness. There are numerous examples of scholars, who by virtue of their moral conduct commanded a great respect and attained the heaven, notwithstanding their births in lower castes. Therefore, the birth in a higher family is not a factor for achievement of greatness.

Therefore, the principle of varna-system, propounded in the Purush Sukta, holds no water. If we think logically, it comes into light that all are born of the same origin—that is Brahma. Now again a question. Are there different categories of Brahmins? If yes, are they the Brahmins who were created from the mouth of Brahma? Because we know a number of Brahmins who were not born from the

mouth of Brahma, but attained Brahminism by virtue of their penance. The same logic is applicable to the Kshatriyas and the Vaishyas. This proves that there were not four varnas but only one varna.

Again a rationale question. How can we divide the children of the same father into four varnas? As for example - there is a man whose name is 'A' and the name of his wife is 'B'. Four sons are born to them. Now the question is how will you decide that which one is Brahmin and others are Kshatriya, Vaishya or Shudra. Because the origin of their birth is the same. The very logic is applicable to the caste-system, though in wide terms. As all the people are the children of the same father i.e., Brahma, the existence of varna-system does not arise.

As we know, the foot prints of a cow, horse, deer or lion are not identical, therefore, we can easily differentiate their footprints. But such is not the case with the four varnas. Their footprints are identical and we cannot differentiate whether these are the footprints of a Brahmin or those of a Shudra. Therefore, obviously, the varna is only one.

Moreover, we can differentiate a cow, ox, horse, ass or goat on the basis of their sex-symbol, size, colour and smell. But such is not the case with human beings. We cannot differentiate them whether this is a Brahmin or a Shudra on the basis of their sex, size, colour and smell. Even the birds are not alike. We can recognise them whether it is a swan or a parrot on the basis of their body, colour, hair, beak, etc., but in the case of human beings such identities are not found, so that we can recognise that so and so is a Brahmin and the other is a Vaishya or a Shudra. We also see that in case of happiness, sorrow, trait, behaviour, birth, death, fear, sex, etc. all the four varnas are alike.

Now I ask the so-called Brahmins whether there is any difference

among the fruits of the same tree, whether they are termed superior or inferior on the ground of different branches they bloom. If there is no difference amongst them, how can we divide the human beings into different classes, for they are the fruits of the same tree - Brahma. As the usefulness of all the fruits of a tree is equal, so is the usefulness of all human beings.

Another relevant question is: if a Brahmin is born from the mouth of a Brahma, what is the origin of a Brahmin woman? The Purush Sukta is silent on this issue. It only deals with the origin of men and not that of women. If the Brahmins put forward an argument that they (Brahmin - women) too are born from the mouth of Brahma, then they should be considered as brothers and sisters because of their birth from the same origin. And if they are brothers and sisters, now the question is whether a brother is allowed to marry his sister.

Therefore, we see that the Vedas, which accord the highest status to the Brahmins, fail to describe the real characteristics of a Brahmin. The Vedas created the confusion regarding the origin of Brahmins and tried to misguide the people. The theological jurisprudences (Dharmasutras) are second to none in creation of a confusing environment. Instead of clarifying the origin of a Brahmin, the scriptures made it more complicated. I have made my best efforts in bringing out the facts regarding the origin of a Brahmin. For this purpose, an in-depth study of the Hindu scriptures was undertaken. Relying on this study, I feel no hesitation in saying that the 'myth of Brahminism' played an appalling role in dividing the Hindu society and, unfortunately, still playing the same role. The supremacy of the Brahmins is a matter of concern and deserves its abolition, because the division of society on religious grounds is not permissible.

●●●

mouth of Brahma, but attained Brahminism by virtue of their penance. The same logic is applicable to the Kshatriyas and the Vaishyas. This proves that there were not four varnas but only one varna.

Again a rationale question. How can we divide the children of the same father into four varnas? As for example - there is a man whose name is 'A' and the name of his wife is 'B'. Four sons are born to them. Now the question is how will you decide that which one is Brahmin and others are Kshatriya, Vaishya or Shudra. Because the origin of their birth is the same. The very logic is applicable to the caste-system, though in wide terms. As all the people are the children of the same father i.e., Brahma, the existence of varna-system does not arise.

As we know, the foot prints of a cow, horse, deer or lion are not identical, therefore, we can easily differentiate their footprints. But such is not the case with the four varnas. Their footprints are identical and we cannot differentiate whether these are the footprints of a Brahmin or those of a Shudra. Therefore, obviously, the varna is only one.

Moreover, we can differentiate a cow, ox, horse, ass or goat on the basis of their sex-symbol, size, colour and smell. But such is not the case with human beings. We cannot differentiate them whether this is a Brahmin or a Shudra on the basis of their sex, size, colour and smell. Even the birds are not alike. We can recognise them whether it is a swan or a parrot on the basis of their body, colour, hair, beak, etc., but in the case of human beings such identities are not found, so that we can recognise that so and so is a Brahmin and the other is a Vaishya or a Shudra. We also see that in case of happiness, sorrow, trait, behaviour, birth, death, fear, sex, etc. all the four varnas are alike.

Now I ask the so-called Brahmins whether there is any difference

among the fruits of the same tree, whether they are termed superior or inferior on the ground of different branches they bloom. If there is no difference amongst them, how can we divide the human beings into different classes, for they are the fruits of the same tree - Brahma. As the usefulness of all the fruits of a tree is equal, so is the usefulness of all human beings.

Another relevant question is: if a Brahmin is born from the mouth of a Brahma, what is the origin of a Brahmin woman? The Purush Sukta is silent on this issue. It only deals with the origin of men and not that of women. If the Brahmins put forward an argument that they (Brahmin - women) too are born from the mouth of Brahma, then they should be considered as brothers and sisters because of their birth from the same origin. And if they are brothers and sisters, now the question is whether a brother is allowed to marry his sister.

Therefore, we see that the Vedas, which accord the highest status to the Brahmins, fail to describe the real characteristics of a Brahmin. The Vedas created the confusion regarding the origin of Brahmins and tried to misguide the people. The theological jurisprudences (Dharmasutras) are second to none in creation of a confusing environment. Instead of clarifying the origin of a Brahmin, the scriptures made it more complicated. I have made my best efforts in bringing out the facts regarding the origin of a Brahmin. For this purpose, an in-depth study of the Hindu scriptures was undertaken. Relying on this study, I feel no hesitation in saying that the 'myth of Brahminism' played an appalling role in dividing the Hindu society and, unfortunately, still playing the same role. The supremacy of the Brahmins is a matter of concern and deserves its abolition, because the division of society on religious grounds is not permissible.



